	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/749,752	AKIMOTO, TAIZO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeanine A Goldberg	1634
Il Participants: Status of Application: <u>After non-final.</u>		
(1) <u>Jeanine A Goldberg</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Cameron Beddard</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 April 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		,
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand.</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a wri	itten summary of the substance ne interview, since the interview
a Modbus		
(Examine SPE Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called for clarification regarding the amendment to Claim 8. The examiner did not know how the recitation changed the means for attaching. The examiner suggested that the means wfor attaching was taught in the specification to be a spotting device, an ink jet printer (page 6). The applicant indicated that this means encompassed a spotter.